

Access to Visitation Grant Program
Applicants' Workshops Questions and Answers for the RFP—Fiscal Years 2003-2004 and 2004-2005:
May 20, 2003 (AOC Southern Regional Office, Burbank)
May 22, 2003 (AOC San Francisco Office)

Superior Courts and Organizations Participating

Superior Court of Alameda County, Family Court Services
Superior Court of Butte County
Superior Court of Calaveras County
Superior Court of El Dorado
Superior Court of Fresno County
Superior Court of Glenn County
Superior Court of Inyo County
Superior Court of Kern County
Superior Court of Los Angeles County
Superior County of Marin County
Mendocino County Family & Youth Services
Superior Court of Napa County, Family Court Services
Superior Court of Nevada County
Superior Court of Orange County
Peace for Families, Placer Women's Center (Placer County)
Superior Court of Riverside County
Superior Court of Sacramento County
Superior Court of San Bernardino County
Superior Court of San Diego County
San Francisco Kids' Turn
Rally Family Visitation Services (San Francisco County)
San Francisco Unified Court
Superior Court of San Joaquin County
Superior Court of San Mateo County
Superior Court of Santa Barbara County
Superior Court of Santa Clara County, Family Court Services
Superior Court of Shasta County
Superior Court of Sonoma County
Superior Court of Tulare County
Superior Court of Ventura County
Superior Court of Yolo County
Superior Court of Yuba County

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS from APPLICANTS' WORKSHOPS

Question 1: Existing vs. new program:

“Grant recipients that make changes or modifications to any component of program service delivery (such as adding a new priority service or a new court/county collaboration partner) will be considered a new program and not an existing program.” (RFP p. 2) If the proposed change is to increase the dollar amount, thereby providing an increase in the number of services provided (but of the same type provided in the current program), would that change in funding result in the program being considered a new program (rather than existing)?

- *No. An increase or decrease of funding based on the new funding allocation will not make an existing program a new program. As described, the program would still be considered an existing program.*

- Question 2:** Administrative reporting new survey requirements: What will the impact be on the courts of the new data reporting survey instrument becoming effective October 1, 2003? (RFP p. 7)
- *Effective October 1, 2003, grant recipients will be required to collect statistical data information (via a survey instrument) on a monthly rather than a quarterly basis. The courts will be responsible for ensuring that the reports are submitted in a timely manner as previously required under the general terms of the contract agreement.*
- Question 3:** How is it possible for courts to comply with the AOC's fiscal and administrative requirements with regard to competitive bidding? Generally a competitive bid (for \$100,000 and far lesser amounts) is a requirement (see AOC Fin. Number 6.01). Can the AOC waive this requirement for this procurement?
- *The trial courts are required to follow the procurement procedures of the Trial Court Financial Policies and Procedures Manual—Fin. Number 6.01. The procedure states that procurements should be competitively bid, but does allow for use of a sole source where that can be justified (see section 6.10—Sole Source Procurements). Applicants should carefully review sections 6.5 and 6.6. The courts may conduct their competitive bidding after the funding has been awarded..*
- Question 4:** Clarification re: Type of Program
What is a single program with a single site that is not a collaboration/partnership? (RFP p. B-2) Does that mean a program that is only run/staffed by court staff?
- *Single program with a single site means an application that is submitted by a single court with program services offered in a single location in the county.*
- Question 5:** Program evaluation responsibilities:
Is the court expected to be conducting a program evaluation of programs either provided by court staff or by subcontractors? Is this a new requirement for a level of evaluation effort above and beyond what was required in the past? If so, how extensive of an effort is this and can that information be provided by the contractor? (RFP p. B-5)
- *Yes. Grant recipients will be required to collect statistical data information on a monthly basis rather than quarterly basis. The new data collection must be completed by the subcontractors.*
- Question 6:** Training expenses
Since only 5% can be budgeted for training, do all of the costs for the AOC mandated fall training program get included in travel expenses (e.g., transportation, lodging etc.)?
- *The Access to Visitation Grant will reimburse programs only for trainings associated with the grant program and not other AOC training or conferences. The five percent cap is for the total program, however, applicants can request approval from the Access to Visitation program manager for additional funding above the five percent cap.*
- Question 7:** Match requirement
Can court staff costs used to administer this grant (payment, evaluation, etc.) be used to provide the match of 20%? (RFP p. F-2)
- *Yes. Match can be either in-kind or cash. Staff time used to administer the grant may be used as a match.*
- Question 8:** Annual audit reports
Is there a requirement that a contract has an annual audit and must it be a certified audit? (RFP p. K-1)

- *No. There is no grant requirement that grantees conduct an annual audit. However, grantees must avail themselves of an audit if the federal government request one. Audits should be certified.*

Question 9: Can a court submit two applications (for example, one existing and one new)?

- *The court can only submit one application as a lead court, but courts can be part of another multi-county collaboration.*

Question 10: Can training and travel be used as match?

- *Yes, this is allowable.*

Question 11: Can a lead court submit two different proposals with two different sub-contractors as long as one proposal is with an existing program and the other is “new”?

- *No. The court can only submit one application as a lead court. The court may have different subcontractors. A lead court may be part of another county collaboration.*

Question 12: Will new proposals and ongoing proposals be ranked together? If so, what is the impact?

- *New proposals will not be evaluated and scored against existing proposals.*

Question 13: Should a new proposal and an ongoing proposal both rank well enough to be recommended for funding, could allocation of funds be adversely affected for either proposal? Of particular concern is two proposals from one lead.

- *There is no plan to reduce applicants’ budget requests unless there are unallowable budget items. The court can only submit one application as a lead court.*

Question 14: Will a new program that contributes to ensuring a geographically diverse set of courts take precedent over an existing program?

- *No. The Selection Review Committee will seek to ensure statewide diversity regarding geography, population, and court size.*

Question 15: Appendix D work plan for is for one year. Do applicants complete two separate forms for the anticipated two years, following the quarterly report format?

- *Applicants are required to submit a two year work plan which can be done either by (1) submitting two separate fiscal year work plans (i.e., FY 2003-2004 and FY 2004-2005) or (2) applicants can simply extend the quarter sections in the work plan (i.e., quarter 5, 6, 7, and 8).*

Question 16: Should proposals show linkages to all the areas funded under this grant? For example, should proposals offer supervised visitation and mediation services, should we discuss these combined services?

- *Proposals should show linkages to the need for program services. There is a question in the proposal which allows applicants to address the issue of linkages to other county/court services (see question 3(a), RFP p. B-3).*

Question 17: If a single court submits two proposals for two different, largely unrelated projects, how will this be viewed by the AOC and the review committee? How will this affect funding?

- *The court can submit only one application as a lead court, but courts can be part of another multi-county collaboration.*

Question 18: If a county has received funding for supervised visitation, will a separate, new program,

multi-county proposal for parent education impact the existing supervised visitation funding?

- *The court can submit only one application as a lead court, but courts can be part of another multi-county collaboration. Only \$780,000 is available statewide for existing programs and one or two new programs.*

Question 19: While we have a collaboration with San Mateo County, San Mateo Superior Court has not been involved in this grant, just the nonprofit agency. Do you consider our relationship as a multi-county collaboration?

- *This would be considered a multi-county collaboration.*

Question 20: In Appendix C (Compliance Statement section), item N, do you want a narrative on this and should the word, “How” be replaced with “Do”?

- *You are correct. It should read: Do you ensure that your program is culturally and linguistically sensitive to the clients you serve and not “how.” If possible, please provide information (in narrative form) on how you do this.*

Question 21: Looking at the possible grant awards listed on page 3, would the amounts be over the course of two years or the awards would be one year?

- *The grant funding period for this RFP is two years (multiyear funding). The grant funds will be awarded on an annual basis (i.e., \$60,000 for FY 2003–2004 and \$60,000 for 2004–2005). Second year funding will be subject to renewal based on an annual program evaluation report. The contract agreement will be for one year. Essentially, the grant will operate in the same manner as previous years.*

Question 22: Do you need two separate letters of intent from both counties, just one with two signatures, or just one with a signature from the lead county while mentioning that this is a collaboration between two or more counties?

- *No. The lead applicant court must submit the letter of intent indicating the following: (1) whether its an existing or new program; (2) whether this is a multi-court collaboration; and (3) a signature from the authorized personnel from the lead or administering court.*

Question 23: Does the court have to pay cash for the 20% matching funds or can this be included as in kind services?

- *Match can be cash or in-kind.*

Question 24: In addition to the one page narrative, can the applicants attach a summary chart of statistical data related to need as an appendix?

- *You can attach a chart if you want, but the Selection Review Committee will only review the proposal narrative section and not attachments or appendices to the application, except for budget information. You should include essential information that links or describes how the statistical data relates to the need for the program for your court.*

Question 25: On the cover page- there is a box to check named “Part of a comprehensive collaboration”. It feels as though we should check this box because we will be collaborating with many agencies. The collaborators will not be “sub-contractors” because their services will be “in-kind”.

- *“Part of a comprehensive collaboration” means a grant application that includes a collaboration between multiple courts and counties versus a single court application. There is a question in the proposal that allows applicants to address collaboration with other agencies (see question 3(a), RFP p. B-3).*

- Question 26:** I read in the grant proposal that you are planning on mostly funding existing programs. Will that change if more money becomes available by existing programs not applying?
- *The preference for funding for this RFP is to fund existing programs and only one or two new programs. If additional funds become available, then the option to fund additional programs (existing and new) will be explored.*
- Question 27:** What's the attachment to the letter of intent? Can the letter of intent be sent by fax or email?
- *There are no required attachments for the letter of intent. The letter of intent may be faxed or e-mailed. The original (signed) letter of intent must be submitted with the grant application.*
- Question 28:** Does the letter of intent have to be signed by the presiding judge?
- *The letter of intent may be signed by the court executive officer, the presiding judge, or the family law judge.*
- Question 29:** Should the letter of intent to be sent on the court's letter head?
- *Yes.*
- Question 30:** If the county has an existing program in collaboration with another county, should the county apply together or separately? Should we do a single county application or court county collaboration application?
- *The preference for funding for this RFP is to fund existing programs and multi-court collaborations.*
- Question 31:** If we didn't get funding two or three years ago, but are reapplying now, are we considered a new or existing program?
- *You are considered a new program. See footnote number one (RFP, p. 2) for the definition of an existing program.*
- Question 32:** If we have an existing program and another court approaches us to join with them, are we a new program or an existing program?
- *If you are an existing program and you add another county to your collaboration, you are now considered a new program. If you are not the lead or administering court, you can join another county collaboration.*
- Question 33:** Does a community based agency providing services have to be a 501(3)(c) or can a non-profit educational institution provide the services?
- *The community-based nonprofit agency must be a 501(3)(c). However, programs that provide therapeutic supervised visitation may use 501(3)(c) agency or licensed therapists.*
- Question 34:** "For fiscal years 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, the Access to Visitation Grant funding preference will be given to existing programs and multi-court county collaborations. (RFP p.2)". When the program reviewers review the grant, will they give preference to the existing programs first and then secondly give to the multi-court county collaborations?
- *The preference is to fund existing programs. This will be given in the form of points. Applications that are an existing program will receive 10 additional points. Applications that include multi-court collaboration will receive 5 additional points.*

- Question 35:** Placer county was once a part of Sacramento County as a collaboration, but last year we were not. If we want to be a part of that collaboration again, will we be a new or old program?
- *This will be considered a new program.*
- Question 36:** As an existing program, if you make any changes or modifications to any component of program service delivery, you will not be an existing program any more, is that right?
- *Correct.*
- Question 37:** Are we discouraging the establishment of new programs or discouraging the continuation of existing program from adding new services?
- *The intent is to fund only one or two new programs. The preference is for existing programs as they currently operate and administer their programs (i.e., same service delivery model as previously administered).*
- Question 38:** Will new programs compete against the existing program?
- *No. New programs will compete against other new programs.*
- Question 39:** Can median and moderate income families- according to HUD guidelines be served under this grant?
- *Fees for service must be made available on a sliding scale basis. The sliding scale for your program (access to visitation clients) must be approved by the court. The goal of the program is to provide accessible services for low-income families, but this does not exclude moderate/median families from receiving program services.*
- Question 40:** For existing programs, if we change the service delivery, will the funding allocation be changed?
- *If a existing program changes their model of service delivery, the program will be considered a new program. Funding allocation is based on county population size and applicants can only apply for the maximum grant amount within their category.*
- Question 41:** If we have private therapists doing supervised visitation, do they have to comply with the standards and sign the compliance statement?
- *Yes. Each subcontractor, whether a nonprofit agency or licensed therapists providing supervised visitation, must sign the compliance statement, which certifies they will follow the Uniform Standards of Practice for Providers of Supervised Visitation as set forth in section 26.2 of the California Standards of Judicial Administration.*
- Question 42:** How many trainings will be provided? Where will they be held? How much will they cost? Should that be included in the budget?
- *There will be two mandatory trainings this year for grant recipients at the AOC: grantee orientation and data collection training. We will also offer training workshops at the annual CFCC Family Dispute Resolution Statewide Educational Institute. Applicants should include costs related to these trainings in their grant application budget.*
- Question 43:** Should the number of collaboration partners be totaled or broken down?
- *The grant application should clearly identify each collaborative partner.*

- Question 44:** If you are collaborating with another county providing services to one county, and one county provides supervised visitation, and another county provides parent education and group counseling, do these services need to match?
- *No. All program services must be within the scope of the grant, however, the collaborating counties can provide different priority program services (i.e., Riverside County will be providing supervised visitation and Orange County will provide parent education services).*
- Question 45:** Should one court only submit one application? Can court be multi-court county collaboration?
- *The court can only submit one application. The lead court or other counties may be part of another collaboration. Multi-court collaboration means a collaboration between two courts or county regions.*
- Question 46:** Can the court apply for more or less of the grant amount?
- *Funding allocation is based on county population size and applicants can only apply for the maximum grant amount within their category. Programs should only apply for what they need and applicants can apply for less than the maximum amount.*
- Question 47:** Do we need to submit two budgets one for each year? Or just one budget?
- *The grant application should include a two year budget. It is recommended that applicants submit their budgets based on the fiscal year of the grant period (i.e., budget and budget narrative for FY 2003–2004 and 2004–2005).*
- Question 48:** What do you mean by “direct service hours”?
- *For supervised visitation and exchange services, direct service hours mean the actual visitation contact or time of the exchange between the noncustodial parent and the child. For parent education and group counseling services, this means the actual time of the workshop/classes or the time spent between the noncustodial parent and the child in the therapy session.*
- Question 49:** Can applicants get a copy of the court site visit report as a sample of what is covered and discussed during the visit?
- *Yes. Please contact Shelly Danridge at shelly.danridge@jud.ca.gov.*